REMARKS

The claims are claims 1 to 10 and 16 to 19.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claims 10 to 15, 20 and 21 are canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to correct minor errors and to further distinguish over the references. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to further distinguish over the references.

New formal drawings are attached. These new formal drawings include labels within elements 6, 8, 44, 48, 77, 80, 82 and 84 of Figures 1 and 2 as required by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 16 to 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as made obvious by the combination of Sezan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,236,395 and Banker et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,485,221.

Claims 1 and 6 recite subject matter not made obvious by the combination of Sezan et al and Banker et al. Claim 1 recites a "filter module operable to access the viewer profile and the supplement data and, in response, to select a preferred display component according to the viewer profile and the supplemental data, the preferred display component operable to target a particular viewer relative to other viewers by supplementing television content" and "an overlay coupled to said television tuner/decoder and to said filter module to substantially simultaneously receive the decoded television signal and the preferred display component." Claim 6 similarly recites "selecting a preferred display component in accordance with the viewer profile and supplemental data, the preferred display component operable to target a particular viewer relative to other viewers." Thus claims 1 and 6 recite that the correspondence between the received television signal and the preferred display component is selected based upon the viewer profile. Sezan et al discloses automatically storing received television signals selected according to a user

-8-

profile. These can be replayed later. Banker et al discloses a cable head end assembled virtual channels which include video and supplemental text data. Banker et al states at column 4, lines 52 to 67:

> "When a selector selects the virtual channel defined in memory, a tuner tunes to the channel of the broadband video signal that the composite video signal occupies as determined from the mapping in memory. Accordingly, the composite video signal may be applied to processing circuitry. In the processing circuitry, the text data stream corresponding to the selected virtual channel can be extracted. The extracted text data stream and the composite video signal are then supplied to an on-screen display control which produces a video output display signal therefrom. When applied to a standard television receiver, the video output display signal produces a picture having both text information from the extracted data stream and video information from the portion of the composite video signal corresponding to the video program defined by the virtual channel."

This portion of Banker et al makes clear that the correspondence between the video and "the text data stream corresponding to the selected virtual channel" is fixed at the transmitter and not selected according to a profile. Banker et al discloses that the user may select one of these fixed combinations but does not teach selection of text data for a particular video is selected according to a profile. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the preferred display component to be overlain upon the decoded television signal is selected by the filter module. Claim 6 likewise recites that preferred display component for the particular received television signal is selected according to the viewer profile. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Sezan et al and Banker et al fail to make obvious the selection of the preferred display component to be displayed with a television signal is selected by a filter module dependent upon a viewer profile. Accordingly,

claims 1 and 6 are allowable over the combination of Sezan et al and Banker et al.

Claims 1 and 6 recite further subject matter not made obvious by the combination of Sezan et al and Banker et al. Claim 1 recites that both the filter module and the overlay are "disposed proximate to the display device and remote from the television service provider." Claim 6 recites that the selecting step and the integrating step are "at a location proximate to the display device and remote from the television service provider." As noted above, Sezan et al does not teach either the claimed selection or overlay/integration. The above quoted portion of Banker et al makes clear that the correspondence between the video and "the text data stream corresponding to the selected virtual channel" is fixed at the transmitter and not selected according to a profile. Banker et al discloses that the user may select one of these fixed combinations but does not teach selection of text data for a particular video is selected according to a profile. Accordingly, the combination of Sezan et al and Banker et al fail to make obvious filtering and integrating at the location of the display and remote from the television service provides. Thus, claims 1 and 6 are not made obvious by the combination of Sezan et al and Banker et al.

Claims 2 to 5, 7 to 10 and 16 to 19 are allowable by dependency upon allowable base claims.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all the present claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore early reconsideration and advance to issue are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed telephone number and address to facilitate prosecution.

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(972) 917-5290
Fax: (972) 917-4418

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Marshall Jr.

Robert D. Marshall, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,527